Vote No. 413

September 13, 1995, 9:13 a.m. Page S-13483 Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM BILL/Voucher Guarantee if Cash is Denied

SUBJECT:

Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 5. Moseley-Braun amendment No. 2471 to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 42-58

SYNOPSIS: As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul six of the Nation's ten largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

The Moseley-Braun amendment would require States, as a condition of receiving family assistance block grants, to establish and to operate voucher programs to provide assistance for minor children of families that were eligible for aid from family assistance block grants but that could not receive it due to time limits, due to the imposition of State penalties, or due to any other reason identified by the State. The value of a voucher would be equal to the value of the benefit that would otherwise be provided for the minor. Vouchers would be used for housing, food, transportation, child care, or any other item or service approved by the State. The State would either arrange for the delivery of goods or services purchased by such vouchers or would provide goods and services directly. (Family assistance block grants would be created by the Dole amendment; they would replace all current Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) programs (AFDC Cash Assistance; AFDC Administration; Emergency Assistance; JOBS Program; IV-A Child Care; Transitional Child Care; and At-Risk Child Care); the Dole amendment would provide States block grant funding for the next 5 years at these programs' FY 1994 funding level).

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Moseley-Braun amendment would protect children from being penalized for the behavior of their parents. Children should not suffer if their parents refused to get jobs or in any other way violated stated requirements and wound up ineligible for family

(See other side)

YEAS (42)			NAYS (58)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans	Democrats (41 or 89%)		Republicans (53 or 98%)		Democrats (5 or 11%)	Republicans	Democrats (0)
(1 or 2%)						(0)	
Specter	Akaka Biden Bingaman Boxer Bradley Breaux Bryan Bumpers Byrd Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Exon Feingold Feinstein Ford Glenn Heflin Hollings	Inouye Johnston Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Mikulski Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Pell Pryor Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Simon Wellstone	Abraham Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brown Burns Campbell Chafee Coats Cochran Cohen Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Dole Domenici Faircloth Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Grassley Gregg Hatch Hatfield	Helms Hutchison Inhofe Jeffords Kassebaum Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Packwood Pressler Roth Santorum Shelby Simpson Smith Snowe Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Baucus Graham Harkin Kohl Nunn	EXPLANAT 1—Official I 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	ily Absent unced Yea unced Nay Yea

VOTE NO. 413 SEPTEMBER 13, 1995

assistance grants. Accordingly, the Moseley-Braun amendment would provide a guarantee that minors would continue to receive benefits for as long as they were needed. It would require States to provide vouchers for children whose parents became ineligible for benefits, and would allow the States to provide those vouchers through third parties. There was a time in this Nation's history when children were commonly abandoned to grow up in the streets or in orphanages. Our colleagues have not offered this bill to return to that time, but unless the Moseley-Braun amendment is adopted that time may well return. We think the purpose of welfare reform should be to get adults to work, not to punish children whose parents fail to work. If our colleagues agree, they should join us in voting in favor of the Moseley-Braun amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

The Moseley-Braun amendment would perpetuate welfare as we know it. It would require States to provide welfare benefits without time limit, or without any other requirement for that matter, to care for minors. Supposedly, the benefits would only flow to the children, not their parents. Surely Senators do not believe such a division is possible. For example, if vouchers were used to pay for shelter, would the parents be allowed inside as well, or would infants get their own apartments? Senators who are worried about cash benefits being cut off should keep in mind that any recipients and "their dependents" who lost cash benefits would still be eligible for Medicaid, food stamps, and housing assistance. These timeless benefits are not enough for our colleagues--they want to replace cash with a voucher to buy those items that would have been bought if cash had been provided. This change would totally undermine the purpose of this bill, which is to replace entitlements with a temporary work transition program.

Supporters of the Moseley-Braun amendment believe that it would be helpful to children. We look at the disastrous history of welfare entitlement programs, which have trapped generations of Americans in serial dependency, and we note that the main purpose of each of these programs has always been the same purpose advanced by the Moseley-Braun amendment--to protect children. How many decades of failure, and how many millions of lives will have to be ruined, before some Senators notice that entitlement welfare spending does not help children? We are convinced that welfare recipients can and should become productive members of society. We are convinced, based on several successful programs that have already been tried in some States, that the States can transform welfare programs into temporary job assistance programs. Our disagreement with the Moseley-Braun amendment is based on a fundamental policy disagreement--we believe welfare entitlements are destructive; our colleagues do not. We know that no matter how much evidence we present we will not be able to change our colleagues' faith in the value of guaranteed Federal Government care. For our part, we recognize the destructiveness of such care, and accordingly will vote against this amendment.